

BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
DOCKET NO. 2004-100-E - ORDER NO. 2004-402

OCTOBER 14, 2004

IN RE:	Application of Progress Energy Carolinas,	)	ORDER GRANTING
	Inc. for a Certificate of Environmental	)	CERTIFICATE
	Compatibility and Public Convenience and	)	
	Necessity for the Construction and Operation	)	
	of Two New 230-kV Transmission Lines;	)	
	Florence Substation to Marion Substation and	)	
	Nichols Substation to Brunswick EMC's	)	
	Peacock POD, near Chadbourn, North	)	
	Carolina.	)	

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) on the April 8, 2004 Application of Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc. (Progress Energy or the Company) for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity, as required under the Utility Facility Siting and Environmental Protection Act, S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-10, et seq. (1976) and (Supp. 2003) (the Siting Act), for the proposed construction and operation of two new 230 kV transmission lines: the first from its Florence transmission substation near Florence to its Marion transmission substation near Marion in Florence, Dillon and Marion Counties in South Carolina and the second from its Nichols transmission substation near Nichols to the South Carolina/North Carolina state line, in Marion and Horry Counties in South Carolina. The Application states that these transmission lines

are needed to prevent overloading of the existing lines in the Florence-Marion-Whiteville area and a degradation of reliability to unacceptable levels by mid-2007. Construction of these lines will help ensure a continued reliable supply of electric service to homes and businesses. The length of the proposed Florence-Marion line is approximately 29 miles, and the length of the proposed line from Nichols to the South Carolina/North Carolina state line is approximately 6.7 miles.

Prior to the submission of its Application, Progress Energy published notice of its intent to apply for a Certificate under the Siting Act, as the provisions of Section 58-33-120(3) require. In addition, the Application included certification that Progress Energy had served a copy of the Application on those governmental officials and such other persons as Section 58-33-120(2) of the Siting Act requires.

Upon receipt of the Company's Application, the Commission's Executive Director required the Company to publish a prepared Notice of Filing and Hearing which described the nature of the Application and advised all interested parties of the manner in which they might intervene or otherwise participate in the proceeding. Progress Energy submitted an affidavit which demonstrated compliance with the Executive Director's instructions. No Petitions to Intervene or Protests were filed. Statutory parties are the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC), the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism (PRT) (the statutory parties).

Subsequently, Progress Energy moved for Expedited Review of this matter. The Motion noted that the deadline for public intervention after publication and service of a

Notice passed, and no one filed a Petition to Intervene. Further, the Company pointed out that no members of the public notified the Commission of any objections to the Commission's issuance of the requested Certificates. In addition, Progress Energy noted that three state agencies notified the Commission of their interest in the proceeding. DNR stated no objection to the issuance of the requested Certificate but did propose certain stipulations be incorporated into the transmission line plans. Progress Energy discussed the stipulations with DNR and has agreed to the recommendations. The Department of Transportation (DOT) indicated that its concerns were satisfied since the Company had agreed to consult with DOT on the final location of the transmission lines relative to the highways. Lastly, the Department of Archives and History (DAH) and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) indicated that the Company's agreement to abide by all State and Federal laws and regulations satisfied their interest in this proceeding. Further, the Commission Staff has no objection to an expedited review of this matter. We would note that the Company has filed the verified testimony of three witnesses to support its case. Because no one intervened in this matter and the parties are willing to waive their rights to a formal hearing in this matter, we hereby grant expedited review. The Commission agenda session with court reporter present shall be deemed the hearing in this matter. Further, S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-130 (1)(1976) states that testimony may be presented in writing.

Progress Energy presented the written verified testimony of Mark Byrd, Steve Wilson, and Kristi Wise in support of its Application.

## **II. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY**

### **Mark Byrd**

Mark Byrd, Manager of Transmission Planning for Progress Energy, is responsible for the long-range infrastructure plans for the Company. Byrd addressed the need and necessity for the construction of the new Florence-Marion 230-kV transmission line and the new Marion-Whiteville 230-kV transmission line. Byrd described the transmission planning process at Progress Energy.

With regard to the Florence-Marion proposed line, Byrd testified that the area between Florence and Marion, South Carolina is mostly rural, although there is significant projected growth in the region and there are also several large industries along this corridor. Loadings on the existing transmission lines in this corridor are significantly impacted by certain critical generation and transmission conditions. According to Byrd, load growth, coupled with line loadings under contingency conditions, will result in the degradation of reliability to unacceptable levels by the summer of 2007. Specifically, Byrd noted that the credible planning contingency of a planned or forced shutdown of the Brunswick Plant, coupled with the loss of the 230-kV line from Florence to Latta will produce line loadings in excess of the 201 MVA rating of the Florence DuPont-Marion 115-kV line. Studies by Progress Energy have shown that the transmission line between Florence and Marion is the weak link in moving power from the Hartsville area generating plants at Darlington County and Robinson into the Pee Dee area and southeastern North Carolina. Byrd noted that an additional transmission line from Florence to Marion is needed to cure the difficulty. Byrd noted that Progress Energy

studied a number of alternatives to attempt to solve this problem, and, for various reasons as discussed in his testimony, rejected all of them except the solution proposed in this case.

With regard to the Marion-Whiteville line, Byrd noted that the area between Marion, South Carolina and Whiteville, North Carolina is mostly rural, with many small towns. The existing transmission line serving this area has been in service for many years and has a smaller wire size than would be used today. Byrd testified that continuing load growth, coupled with certain critical generation and transmission conditions will overload the existing transmission lines in the Marion-Whiteville area by the summer of 2007, resulting in an unacceptable degradation of reliability.

Specifically, according to Byrd, the credible planning contingency of a planned or forced shutdown of the Brunswick Plant coupled with the loss of the 230-kV line from Cumberland to Whiteville will produce line loading in excess of the 178 MVA rating of the Marion-Whiteville 115-kV line. Byrd stated that, currently, there is no 230-kV capability that reaches from Marion toward Whiteville at one end and from Whiteville toward Marion at the other end. The “gap” between these line sections is approximately 21 miles. The proposed project is to construct approximately 21 miles of 230-kV line. The new line will complete the “gap” and result in a new transmission connection from Marion to Whiteville, constructed to operate at 230-kV. This will provide a second direct path from Marion to Whiteville. The new line will be operated initially at 115-kV. Area substations and EMC PODs on these two lines will be served in such a manner as to relieve contingency overloading and to provide adequate voltage. Byrd noted that at such

time as it is necessary, the newly constructed line section, along with the sections already completed, will be changed to 230-kV operation. Area substations and Brunswick Electric Membership Corporation's point of deliveries (EMC PODs) will be converted to 230-kV when necessary. Again, a number of alternatives to the present proposal were studied by the Company, but all were rejected except the present proposal.

According to Byrd, the proposed new Florence-Marion and Marion-Whiteville 230-kV transmission lines are the most cost-effective options for providing the needed transmission system upgrades. Further, according to the Company's studies, the proposed new lines will produce the greatest service reliability for Progress Energy's customers. These projects provided the best overall long-term system enhancements and were chosen as the optimum solution to the system's long-term needs, according to the Company.

Byrd noted that in the absence of these transmission lines Progress Energy will soon begin to experience overloads under the contingency conditions of loss of area generation coupled with the loss of an area transmission line. The proposed two new 230-kV lines will relieve the overloading in the existing corridors and will provide for long term load growth in the Company's Southern and Eastern regions. Customer growth in population and electric usage is expected to place greater demands on the distribution and transmission systems in the Company's Southern and Eastern regions. Load growth is projected to increase approximately two to three percent each year for the next ten years. Byrd further testified that these projects will reduce contingency loadings on the existing transmission lines to acceptable levels, allowing the Robinson Plant and Darlington

County Plant generation complex to operate at full output to help Progress Energy meet customer demands for electricity in both regions. Byrd noted that these projects would also improve the power quality and reliability in the area, and reduce the frequency and duration of potential power outages. Further, Byrd stated that without the transmission system upgrades, load in the area would exceed the electric system capability in the near future.

Byrd testified that the proposed two new transmission lines are clearly in the interests of system economy and reliability. Continuing load growth, coupled with contingency conditions will result in overloads on the existing transmission lines in the Florence-Marion-Whiteville area and a degradation of reliability to unacceptable levels by the summer of 2007. The proposed new transmission lines, according to Byrd, will provide the additional transmission system capability necessary to prevent the overloads and maintain adequate reliability. Without the addition of the two new transmission lines, overloading of the existing transmission system would inhibit the transfer of economical power to serve Progress Energy's customers. Byrd noted that, in this case, Progress Energy would be unable to transmit to its customers the low-cost power produced by its generating plants in Darlington County, resulting in higher costs to consumers, and that constructing the two new 230 kV lines will alleviate the potential overload and facilitate the continued transmission of low-cost power resulting in economical operation of the Company's system.

Steve Wilson

Steve Wilson, a Project Manager in the Transmission Department of Progress Energy, also testified on behalf of the Company. Wilson explained how the Company's preferred route was selected and how public input was incorporated into the route selection process. Wilson also discussed the potential environmental impacts of the project and the mitigation techniques proposed by the Company to minimize the impacts. After establishing the study area, potential alternative routes were identified. Wilson noted that the objective was to identify routes connecting the Florence Substation to the Marion Substation and the existing lines between the Nichols Substation and the EMC Peacock POD, while avoiding or minimizing impacts to both human and natural resources. Local, State, and Federal government agencies were contacted to obtain information relevant to the routing process. Homes and other features located near each potential route were identified during field reconnaissance in which all potential routes were assessed. If serious problems were identified along a route, adjustments to the route were made to minimize the potential impacts or the route was removed from consideration, according to Wilson.

Following the identification of potential alternative routes, public input was solicited via public information meetings held by Progress Energy in February 2003 in each of the study areas, and via information available on the Progress Energy project website. According to Wilson, the public participation program provided the public with an explanation of the need for the project and the opportunity to comment on the decision-making criteria to be used to select the preferred route. It also provided the



public with a forum to ask questions and voice their opinion regarding the proposed routes. Using the information collected from the public, field reconnaissance, agency contacts, and review of aerial photography and U.S.G.S. quadrangle maps, the study team quantified the social and environmental resources that would be impacted by each possible route for both projects. Ultimately, according to Wilson, a preferred route and alternate route for the proposed transmission lines were identified, which the Company considered to have the least overall impacts of the alternatives studied.

Wilson described the proposed Florence to Marion line, the study area for the line and the alternative routes considered, as well as the route ultimately selected as the preferred route. Wilson noted that the preferred route was selected because of all the alternatives identified to meet the needs, it will have the fewest environmental impacts. The estimated cost for the proposed Florence to Marion line is approximately \$20,000,000. Wilson also described the proposed line from the Nichols substation to the Brunswick EMC's Peacock POD, near Chadbourn, North Carolina, and matters similar to those discussed with regard to the Florence to Marion line. Again, Wilson noted that the preferred route was selected because it will have only minimal to moderate impacts on the human and natural environments. The total cost of the Nichols to Chadbourn line is approximately \$17,200,000.

Wilson testified that the proposed transmission projects will conform to all applicable State and local laws and regulations. Finally, Wilson stated that once Commission approval is attained, Progress Energy will notify the landowners affected by the new transmission lines, as well as those landowners who attended the public

workshops of the selection and approval of the routes. CP&L will then begin acquiring easements from landowners, according to Wilson, and will work with them to identify adjustments to the route that will minimize impacts on each landowner's property, if possible. Both lines will be in service by the summer of 2007.

Kristi Wise

Kristi Wise, a Senior Environmental Scientist and Project Manager for Burns and McDonnell, also filed written verified testimony. Ms. Wise testified as to potential environmental impacts of the projects and the mitigation techniques that Progress Energy will use to mitigate the impacts. She also testified as to the cultural resource investigations conducted.

According to Ms. Wise, many potential environmental and land use impacts of these projects were minimized during the initial siting process by avoidance. Each of the proposed transmission lines follows direct routes frequently along existing corridors, thereby reducing environmental and land use impacts. Impacts to wetland, threatened and endangered species and cultural resources will be minimized, according to Ms. Wise, as required by the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), respectively. All clearing, construction and maintenance will be completed in accordance with Best Management Practices (BMP) published by the South Carolina Forestry Commission. Visual impacts will be minimized by using a single pole made of weathering steel that will blend in with the surrounding trees and by paralleling other existing transmission lines as much as possible in these areas.

Ms. Wise noted that the Florence-Marion preferred route was selected because it will have relatively minor overall impacts. The preferred route parallels both existing transmission lines and gas pipelines for approximately 86% of its length, which reduces the required new right-of-way and minimizes impacts to agricultural land, woodland and wetlands. According to Ms. Wise, the preferred route also has minimal residential impacts compared to most of the alternative routes. Only three houses are located within 200 feet of the preferred route. Ms. Wise concluded that the Florence Substation-Marion Substation Transmission Line Project will have minimal to moderate impacts on natural and human resources in the study area. The preferred route will have relatively minor overall impacts. The potential impacts are mitigated by following existing transmission lines between the Florence and Marion substations.

With regard to the cultural resource investigation of the Florence-Marion preferred route, over 140 recorded archaeological sites, landmarks, and historical structures were identified within the study area, according to Ms. Wise. Only nine of these sites are either eligible or recommended to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). An additional 28 sites are potentially eligible for inclusion on the NRHP. The SHPO needs additional information for these sites before a determination of eligibility can be made. Five sites in the study area are listed on the NRHP. None of the eligible or listed NRHP sites will be impacted by the proposed route.

The Marion-Whiteville preferred route was selected because it will have the least overall environmental and social impacts, according to Ms. Wise. The route parallels both existing transmission lines and gas pipelines, which reduces the required new right-

of-way, and minimizes impacts to agricultural land, woodland and wetlands compared to all-new rights-of-way. The preferred route has minimal residential impacts compared to the other routes considered. The construction and operation of the proposed project will have minimal effects on the natural resources and human resources within the study area. There are no homes located within 200 feet of the preferred route. The portion of the route in South Carolina will follow existing transmission lines for its entire length.

The route identification process included avoidance, to the extent possible, of known historical and archaeological resources. A records search of the study area was conducted. A total of 25 recorded archaeological sites, landmarks, and historical structures were located within the study area, none of which were located in South Carolina. There are no NRHP-listed or eligible archaeological sites or historical structures within 1,300 feet of the preferred route, according to Ms. Wise.

In summary, Ms. Wise noted that the proposed route for the Florence-Marion line was selected from nearly two hundred routes considered because it would have the least overall cumulative environmental and social impacts. Similarly, the proposed route for the Marion-Whiteville line was selected from over a hundred routes considered because it would have the least overall environmental and social impacts.

### **III. FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Progress Energy proposes to construct, operate, and maintain two new 230 kV transmission lines, known respectively as the Florence-Marion 230-kV transmission line and the Marion-Whiteville 230-kV transmission line.

2. Progress Energy provided public notice of its intent to file the Application for the project transmission lines as required by S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-120(2). Further, Progress Energy provided evidence of public notice of the project Application by publication as required by S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-120(3). Following the actual filing of the Application, Progress Energy filed with the Commission evidence of publication of a Commission prepared Notice of Filing and Hearing that advised the public of the filing of the Application, of the manner and time to file pleadings to become a party in the proceedings, and of the date of the hearing on the Application. Progress Energy and the Commission have satisfied all statutory requirements for notice and opportunity for hearing as required by the Siting Act.

3. The Company demonstrated various scenarios which illustrated overloads if the two new transmission lines are not built. Also, customer growth in population and electric usage is expected to place greater demands on the distribution system in the areas. Progress Energy has established the basis for the need for the transmission lines.

4. The Commission finds the impact of the new transmission lines upon the environment to be justified, considering the state of available technology and the nature and economics of the various alternatives and other pertinent considerations.

5. The new transmission lines will best serve the interests of system economy and reliability.

6. There is a reasonable assurance that the proposed transmission lines will conform to applicable State and local laws and regulations.

7. The public convenience and necessity require the construction of the new transmission lines.
8. The preferred routes are approved for the proposed transmission lines.
9. The requisite Certificate is granted for the transmission lines following the preferred routes.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISCUSSION**

1. S.C. Code Ann Section 58-33-160 provides
  - (1) The Commission shall render a decision upon the record either granting or denying the application as filed, or granting it upon such terms, conditions or modifications of the construction, operation or maintenance of the major utility facility as the Commission may deem appropriate; such conditions shall be as determined by the applicable State agency having jurisdiction or authority under statutes, rules, regulations or standards promulgated thereunder, and the conditions shall become a part of the certificate. The Commission may not grant a certificate for the construction, operation and maintenance of a major utility facility, either as proposed or as modified by the Commission, unless it shall find and determine:
    - (a) The basis of the need for the facility.
    - (b) The nature of the probable environmental impact.
    - (c) That the impact of the facility upon the environment is justified, considering the state of available technology and the nature and economics of the various alternatives and other pertinent considerations.
    - (d) That the facilities will serve the interests of system economy and reliability.
    - (e) That there is a reasonable assurance that the proposed facility will conform to applicable State and local laws and regulations issued thereunder, including any allowable variance provisions therein, except that the Commission may refuse to apply any local law or local regulation if it finds that, as applied to the

proposed facility, such law or regulation is unreasonably restrictive in view of the existing technology, or of factors of cost or economics or of the needs of consumers whether located inside or outside of the directly affected government subdivisions.

(f) That public convenience and necessity require the construction of the facility.

(2) If the Commission determines that the location of all or a part of the proposed facility should be modified, it may condition its certificate upon such modification, provided that the municipalities and persons residing therein affected by the modification shall have been given reasonable notice.

(3) A copy of the decision and any opinion shall be served by the Commission upon each party.  
(Emphasis added.)

2. S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-160 provides the Commission with the authority to grant an application as filed, grant the application upon such terms, conditions or modifications of the construction, operation or maintenance of the project as the Commission deems appropriate, or deny the application. Should the Commission entertain modification of the location of all or part of the project, the Commission, pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-160(2), must find and conclude “that the municipalities and persons residing therein affected by the modification shall have been given reasonable notice.” S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-160(2) (1976).

Progress Energy filed with the Commission the Application which is the subject of the instant case. As required by statute, the Application contained, *inter alia*, a description of the facilities to be built, a summary of all studies which have been made by or for the applicant of the environmental impact of the facilities, and a statement of the need for the facility. The Routing Study and Environmental Report, included as Exhibit B

to the Application, provided details of the environmental studies and analysis of proposed and alternate routes for the projects. In its Application, Progress Energy also provided evidence that it had complied with the notice requirements of S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-120(2) (1976) by providing proof of service that Progress caused a copy of the Application to be served on the chief executive officer of each municipality and the head of each State and local government agency charged with the duty of protecting the environment of planning land use in the area in the county in which any portion of the project is to be located. With the Application, Progress Energy also provided proof of public notice by publication to persons residing in the municipalities entitled to receive notice as required by S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-120(3) (1976). Further, subsequent to filing the Application of the proposed project, Progress Energy published, as directed by the Commission's Executive Director, a Notice of Filing and Hearing in newspapers of general circulation in the area of the proposed project. This Notice of Filing and Hearing advised the public of the project Application, of the manner and time in which to file pleadings to become a party in the proceeding, and of the actual hearing date on the Application.

We therefore conclude that the project Application was sufficiently noticed to the public and that reasonable notice was afforded to the public of the Application pending before the Commission. Therefore, we conclude that we may consider the proposed route, as well as the alternate routes, of the project as contained in the Application and the evidence from the hearing.



3. The Company has demonstrated the basis of the need for the new transmission lines. The testimony of Mark Byrd provides the requisite evidence. Byrd testified that Progress Energy's continuous assessment of electric system requirements has identified the need for transmission projects to help ensure a continued reliable supply of electric service to homes and businesses. Byrd pointed out that projected electric load in the study area is expected to exceed system capability under peak contingency conditions. Additional constraints on the existing electric transmission system in the area, coupled with significant customer growth in population and electric usage, have prompted the need for Progress Energy to upgrade its transmission facilities in the area. The Company performed certain studies which showed overload conditions without construction of new transmission lines. The proposed project will reduce contingency loadings on existing transmission lines to acceptable levels, will improve the power quality and reliability in the area, and will reduce the frequency and duration of potential power outages. Byrd also points to increased growth in customer population. Thus, the need for the new transmission line is apparent.

4. The nature of the probable environmental impact is minimal. The testimony of Company witness Kristi Wise indicates that the proposed project will have minimal effects on natural resources. According to the testimony, construction and operation of the transmission line is not projected to result in any significant impact to the existing topography or surface water features. Progress Energy has acknowledged correspondence received by the Commission from the South Carolina Department of

Natural Resources (DNR) and the Company agreed to the recommendations of DNR concerning the project.

The DNR recommendations are hereby adopted. These are as follows:

a) Transmission line construction must be accomplished in existing disturbance corridors where practicable. Upon completion, all disturbed areas must be permanently stabilized with vegetative cover and/or riprap, as appropriate.

b) To the greatest extent practicable, clearing of riparian vegetation within wetlands and waters of the U.S. must be conducted manually and low growing, woody vegetation and shrubs must be left intact to maintain stream bank stability and reduce erosion.

c) Right-of-ways through and adjacent to wetlands should be maintained by hand clearing rather than with chemicals to reduce the potential for contamination of downstream aquatic resources.

d) Stream banks at crossings must be restored after construction has been completed. Disturbed stream banks can be restored by planting woody vegetation and by using bioengineering techniques for stream bank stabilization.

e) Construction activities must avoid to the greatest extent practicable, encroachment into any wetland areas outside the transmission line right-of-way.

Further, and according to the evidence, the projects will be designed to span or avoid wetland areas where possible, and any possible impacts to wetlands would be temporary in nature. Impacts to wildlife may occur, but would also be temporary in nature. Progress Energy also employed and will employ certain other measures to

minimize the environmental impact of the project. The transmission lines clearing and construction activities are designed to minimize environmental impacts. All clearing, construction and maintenance will be completed in accordance with Best Management Practices published by the South Carolina Forestry Commission. Thus, because Progress Energy is committed to employing Best Management Practices in the clearing and construction activities, utilizing existing right-of-way where possible, and following the guidelines suggested by DNR, the Commission concludes that the probable environmental impact is minimal.

5. Using the preferred routes for the two transmission lines as approved herein, the Commission finds and concludes the impact of the new transmission line upon the environment to be justified, considering the state of available technology and the nature and economics of the various alternatives and other pertinent considerations.

6. The new transmission line will serve the interest of system economy and reliability. Progress Energy references customer growth and subsequent overload scenarios as major factors in justifying that the transmission line will provide system reliability. According to the record, the proposed transmission line project will reduce contingency loadings on existing transmission lines to acceptable levels, will also improve the power quality and reliability in the area, and will reduce the frequency and duration of potential power outages. Further, without the transmission upgrade, Progress Energy asserts that load in the area would exceed the electric system capability in the near future.

7. There is reasonable assurance that the proposed transmission line will conform to applicable State and local laws and regulations issued thereunder. Progress Energy witness Wilson stated that the Company adheres to all State, Federal, and local laws and that the Company works with State and Federal agencies to obtain the appropriate permits and reviews in order to ensure that Progress Energy is complying with the laws. The Commission can reasonably conclude from the record that there is a reasonable assurance that the proposed facility will conform with all applicable laws.

8. The public convenience and necessity require the construction of the facility. Due to the established need and the necessity of the proposed line for Progress Energy to continue to provide reliable service to its service area, the Commission can conclude that the public convenience and necessity require the construction of the herein approved transmission line.

9. The Routing Study and Environmental Report presented in this case shall not be precedential in any future siting case. While the Application, including the Routing Study and Environmental Report, is sufficient to justify the siting of the transmission lines approved by this Commission in the instant case, each siting Application must be considered on a case by case basis, and the studies reported to the Commission in the instant proceeding hold no precedential value to future siting cases.

10. The requested certificate should be granted for the two 230 kV lines, since Progress Energy has satisfied all of the statutory requirements found in S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-160 (1976).

11. The approval for siting of the lines stated herein shall not be construed as approval of any of the stated costs of the projects. Such costs may be considered in a future rate case.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The Application of Progress Energy for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity be and hereby is, approved, and the Certificate is granted for both of the requested 230-kV transmission lines.

2. This Order shall remain in full force and effect until further Order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

/s/  
Randy Mitchell, Chairman

ATTEST:

/s/  
G. O'Neal Hamilton, Vice Chairman

(SEAL)